REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 15-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by US patent publication 2002/0174306 by Gajjar et al. (Gajjar). Claims 7-14, 21, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Gajjar in view of US patent publication 2004/0123063 by Dalal (Dalal).

Applicants thank the Examiner for the telephone interview of August 4, 2008. We discussed the present invention and a proposed amendment. The Examiner suggested an additional limitation to which Applicants agreed. Applicants submit the proposed amendment with the additional limitation with this response.

Amendments to the Claims

Applicants have amended claim 1 with the limitation "…a specification module configured to specify a Logical Unit Number (LUN) storage resource as a model storage resource in a modeling policy; a monitoring module configured to monitor a plurality of existing storage resources corresponding to a client, wherein one of the plurality of existing storage resources designated is the~~as a~~ model storage resource…" The amendment is well supported by the specification. See page 12, ¶ 44; page 13, ¶ 45; page 15, ¶ 55. Claims 11 and 15 are similarly amended.

Response to rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6 and 15-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Gajjar.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 1 includes the limitations:

> a specification module configured to **specify a Logical Unit Number (LUN) storage resource as a model storage resource in a modeling policy**;
>
> a monitoring module configured to monitor a plurality of existing storage resources corresponding to a client, wherein one of the plurality of existing storage resources designated is the model storage resource;
>
> a policy module configured to store a plurality of storage provisioning policies, the plurality of storage provisioning policies defining a modeling policy; and
>
> a provisioning module configured to **provision a new storage resource** for the client according to the modeling policy, **the new storage resource modeled after the model storage resource**.

Independent claim 15 includes similar limitations. Applicants submit that Gajjar does not disclose specifying a LUN storage resource as a model storage resource in a modeling policy and provisioning a new storage resource modeled after the model storage resource. Instead Gajjar teaches provisioning a new storage device that meets new/storage profiles. Gajjar, page 4, ¶ 46-47; page 5, ¶ 54-55. Because Gajjar does not disclose each element of claims 1 and 15, Applicants submit that claims 1 and 15 are allowable, and that claims 2-6 and 16-20 are allowable as depending from allowable claims.

Response to rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 7-14, 21, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Gajjar in view of Dalal. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Independent claim 11 includes the limitations:

> a client having a file system;
>
> a storage resource manager server configured to monitor a plurality of existing storage resources corresponding to the client, **specify a LUN storage resource as a model storage resource in a modeling policy**, wherein the model storage resource is one of the plurality of existing storage resources, and to **provision a new storage resource** for the client according to the modeling policy, **the new storage resource modeled after the model storage resource**; and
>
> a storage server configured to store the model storage resource and the new storage resource.

Applicants submit that Gajjar and Dalal do not disclose specifying a LUN storage resource as a model storage resource in a modeling policy and provisioning a new storage resource modeled after the model storage resource. As discussed above, Gajjar does not disclose this limitation. Dalal also does not disclose specifying a LUN storage resource as a model storage resource in a modeling policy and provisioning a new storage resource modeled after the model storage resource. Applicants therefore submit that claim 11 is allowable as Gajjar and Dalal do not disclose each element of the claim, and that claims 7-10, 12-14, 21, and 22 are

allowable as depending from allowable claims.

Conclusion

As a result of the presented remarks, Applicants assert that the application is in condition

for prompt allowance. Should additional information be required regarding the traversal of the

rejections of the claims enumerated above, Examiner is respectfully asked to notify Applicants of

such need. If any impediments to the prompt allowance of the claims can be resolved by a

telephone conversation, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

    /Brian C. Kunzler/

Brian C. Kunzler
Reg. No. 38,527
Attorney for Applicant

Date: August 20, 2008
8 East Broadway, Suite 600
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
Telephone (801) 994-4646
Fax (801) 531-1929